



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/645,020

08/23/2000

Robert Wallach

17246-004

2332

54205 7590 11/25/2008

CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

FRENEL, VANEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3687

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/25/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/645,020	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WALLACH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> VANEL FRENEL	<b>Art Unit</b> 3687	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18, 19, 27-29, 60-69, 75-80 and 98 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-19, 27-29, 60-69, 75-80, 98 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to the request for reconsideration filed on 8/18/08. Claims 18-19, 27-29, 60-69 and 75-80 and 98 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:  
Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.
3. Claims 29, 63, 69, 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 29, 63, 69 and 80 recite a process comprising the steps of receiving, receiving and calculaing. Based on Supreme Court precedent, a proper process must be tied to another statutory class or transform underlying subject matter to a different state or thing (*Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876)). Since neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not considered a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. 101. To qualify as a statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplished the method steps or positively reciting the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 18-19, 27-29, 60-69 and 75-80 and 98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osborn et al (6,182,048) in view of Thomson et al (2003/0061104).

As per claim 18, Osborn discloses a method for using a computer system to provide an insurance policy relating to a sale or lease of an item (See Osborn, Co1.2, lines 60-67 to Co1.3, line 14); determining on said computer system a premium for the insurance policy (See Osborn, Co1.3, lines 15-25); the premium based on a class of the item and a geographic region of the buyer or lessee without consideration of individual characteristics of the buyer or lessee (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65).

Osborn does not explicitly disclose receiving an indication of an item sold to a buyer or lessed to a lessee for which insurance is provided by a third party; charging a premium for the insurance policy to the third party.

However, these features are known in the art, as evidenced by Thompson. In particular, Thompson suggests that the method having receiving an indication of an item sold to a buyer or lessed to a lessee for which insurance is provided by a third party (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0015; Page 8, Paragraph 0117); charging a

Art Unit: 3687

premium for the insurance policy to the third party (See Thompson, Page 6, Paragraphs 0086-0092).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Thompson within the system of Osborn with the motivation of providing an electronic warranty administration system that interfaces between customers and sellers and/or manufacturers (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0016).

As per claim 19, Osborn discloses a method for using a computer system to determine an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item (See Osborn, Col.2, lines 60-67 to Col.3, line 14), comprising: calculating on said computer system a premium to be charged for each insurance policy issued to buyers or lessees in the geographic area (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65); an indication of a geographic region in which a buyer or lessee must reside to receive the insurance, the premium being based on the class of items and the geographic region, without consideration of further characteristics of the buyer (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65).

Osborn does not explicitly disclose receiving, from a manufacturer, an indication of a class of items for which insurance is to be provided to a buyer or lessee of one of the class of items; receiving, from a manufacturer.

Art Unit: 3687

However, these features are known in the art, as evidenced by Thompson. In particular, Thompson suggests that the method having receiving, from a manufacturer (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0015).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Thompson within the system of Osborn with the motivation of providing an electronic warranty administration system that interfaces between customers and sellers and/or manufacturers (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0016).

As per claim 27, Osborn discloses an apparatus for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item (Col.) comprising: means for calculating a premium to be charged for each insurance policy issued to buyers or lessees in the geographic area (See Osborn Col. 1, lines 53-65); means for receiving, from a manufacturer, an indication of a class of items for which insurance is to be provided to a buyer or lessee of one of the class of items (See Osborn, Co1.3, lines 1-26); means for receiving, from a manufacturer, an indication of a geographic region in which a buyer or lessee must reside to receive the insurance (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65); the premium being based on the class of items and the geographic region, without consideration of individual characteristics of the buyer or lessee (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65).

Osborn does not explicitly disclose an apparatus for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item. However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Thompson. In particular,

Art Unit: 3687

Thompson suggests that the method having an apparatus for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0015).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Thompson within the system of Osborn with the motivation of providing an electronic warranty administration system that interfaces between customers and sellers and/or manufacturers (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0016).

As per claim 28, Osborn discloses comprising: a processor (See Osborn, Col.4, lines 28-34); and a memory in electrical communication with the processor, the memory for storing a plurality of processing instructions for enabling the processor to: and calculate a premium to be charged for each insurance policy issued to buyers or lessees in the geographic area (See Osborn Co1.1, lines 53-65); receive, from a manufacturer, an indication of a class of items for which insurance is to be provided to a buyer or lessee of one of the class of items (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65); receive, from a manufacturer, an indication of a geographic region in which a buyer or lessee must reside to receive the insurance (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65); the premium being based on the class of items and the geographic region, without consideration of individual characteristics of the buyer or lessee (See Osborn, Col. 1, lines 53-65). Osborn does not explicitly disclose an apparatus for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Thompson. In particular, Thompson suggests an apparatus for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item (See Thompson, Page 6, Paragraphs 0086-0092).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Thompson within the system of Osborn with the motivation of providing an electronic warranty administration system that interfaces between customers and sellers and/or manufacturers (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0016).

As per claim 29, Osborn discloses calculating a premium to be charged for each insurance policy issued to buyers or lessees in the geographic area (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65); receiving, from a manufacturer, an indication of a class of items for which insurance is to be provided to a buyer or lessee of one of the class of items (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65); receiving, from a manufacturer, an indication of a geographic region in which a buyer or lessee must reside to receive the insurance (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65); the premium being based on the class of items and the geographic region, without consideration of individual characteristics of the buyer or lessee (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65).

Osborn does not explicitly disclose a computer-readable medium encoded with processing instructions for implementing a method, performed by a computer, for



Art Unit: 3687

determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer of an item.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Thompson. In particular, Thompson suggests a computer-readable medium encoded with processing instructions for implementing a method, performed by a computer, for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer of an item (See Thompson, Page 6, Paragraphs 0086-0092).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Thompson within the system of Osborn with the motivation of providing an electronic warranty administration system that interfaces between customers and sellers and/or manufacturers (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0016).

As per claim 60, Osborn discloses a method operable on a computer for providing an insurance policy relating to sale or a lease of an item (See Osborn, Col.2, lines 60-67 to Col.3, line 14), charging a premium for the insurance policy to the third party, the premium based on characteristics of the class of the item, the expected demographics of the buyer or lessee of the item and a geographic region of the buyer or lessee, without consideration of individual qualifications of the buyer or lessee (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65).

Osborn does not explicitly disclose receiving on the computer an indication of an item leased to a buyer or lessee for which insurance is provided by a third party.

Art Unit: 3687

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Thompson. In particular, Thompson suggests that the method having receiving on the computer an indication of an item leased to a buyer or lessee for which insurance is provided by a third party (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0015; Page 8, Paragraph 0117).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Thompson within the system of Osborn with the motivation of providing an electronic warranty administration system that interfaces between customers and sellers and/or manufacturers (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0016).

As per claim 61, Osborn discloses comprising: calculating on the computer a premium to be charged for each insurance policy issue to the buyer or lessee in the geographic region (See Osborn Co1.1, lines 53-65); receiving, from a manufacturer, an indication of a class of items for which insurance is to be provided to a buyer or lessee of one of the class of items; receiving, from a manufacturer, an indication of a geographic region in which the buyer or lessee must reside to receive the insurance (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65); the premium being based on characteristics of the class of items, the expected demographics of the lessees of the class of items and the geographic region, without consideration of individual characteristics of the buyer or lessee (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65).

Art Unit: 3687

Osborn does not explicitly disclose a method operable on a computer for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Thompson. In particular, Thompson suggests a method operable on a computer for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0015; Page 8, Paragraph 0117).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Thompson within the system of Osborn with the motivation of providing an electronic warranty administration system that interfaces between customers and sellers and/or manufacturers (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0016).

As per claim 62, Osborn discloses comprising: calculating on the computer a premium to be charged for an insurance policy issued to the buyer or lessee (See Osborn Col.2, lines 60-67 to Col.3, line 14); receiving an indication of a class of items for which insurance is to be provided to a buyer or lessee of one of the class of items (See Osborn, Co1.2, lines 60-67 to Co1.3, line 25); receiving an indication of a geographic region in which the buyer or lessee must reside to receive the insurance, the premium being based on the characteristics of the class of items the anticipated demographics of the buyer or lessee and the geographic region, without consideration of individual characteristics of the buyer or lessee (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65).

Art Unit: 3687

Osborn does not explicitly disclose a method operable on a computer for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Thompson. In particular, Thompson suggests a method operable on a computer for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0015; Page 8, Paragraph 0117).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Thompson within the system of Osborn with the motivation of providing an electronic warranty administration system that interfaces between customers and sellers and/or manufacturers (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0016).

As per claim 63, Osborn discloses comprising: means for calculating a premium to be charged for each insurance policy issued to the buyer or lessee (See Osborn Co1.1, lines 53-65); means for receiving an indication of a class of items for which insurance is to be provided to a buyer or lessee of one of the class of items means for receiving an indication of a geographic region in which the buyer or lessee must reside to receive the insurance (See Osborn, Col.1, lines 53-65); the premium being based on the characteristics of the class of items, the anticipated demographics of the buyer or lessee and the geographic region, without consideration of individual characteristics of the buyer or lessee (See Osborn, Col. 1, lines 53-65).

Osborn does not explicitly disclose an apparatus for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item. However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Thompson. In particular, Thompson suggests an apparatus for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0015; Page 8, Paragraph 0117).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Thompson within the system of Osborn with the motivation of providing an electronic warranty administration system that interfaces between customers and sellers and/or manufacturers (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0016).

As per claim 64, Joao discloses an apparatus for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item (Col.), comprising: a processor (See Osborn Col.4, lines 28-34) and a memory in communication with the processor, the memory for storing a plurality of processing instructions enabling the processor (See Osborn, Fig.2; Col.2, lines 60-67) to: calculate a premium to be charged for each insurance policy issued to the buyer or lessee (See Osborn Co1.1, lines 53-65); receive an indication of a class of items for which insurance is to be provided to a buyer or lessee of one of the class of items (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65); receive an indication of a geographic region in which the buyer or lessee must reside to receive the insurance (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65); the premium

Art Unit: 3687

being based on the characteristics of the class of items, the anticipated demographics of the buyer or lessee and the geographic region, without consideration of individual characteristics of the buyer or lessee (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65).

Osborn does not explicitly disclose an apparatus for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item. However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Thompson. In particular, Thompson suggests an apparatus for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0015; Page 8, Paragraph 0117).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Thompson within the system of Osborn with the motivation of providing an electronic warranty administration system that interfaces between customers and sellers and/or manufacturers (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0016).

As per claim 65, Osborn discloses calculating a premium to be charged for each issued to the buyer or lessee (See Osborn Col.1, lines 53-65); receiving an indication of a class of items for which insurance is to be provided to a buyer or lessee of one of the class of items (See Osborn, Col. 1, lines 53-65); receiving an indication of a geographic region in which the buyer or lessee must reside to receive the insurance (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65); the premium being based on characteristics of the class of items, the expected demographics of the buyer and the geographic region, without

Art Unit: 3687

consideration of individual characteristics of the buyer or lessee (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65).

Osborn does not explicitly disclose a computer-readable medium encoded with processing instructions for implementing a method, performed by a computer, for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Thompson. In particular, Thompson suggests a computer-readable medium encoded with processing instructions for implementing a method, performed by a computer, for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0015; Page 8, Paragraph 0117).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Thompson within the system of Osborn with the motivation of providing an electronic warranty administration system that interfaces between customers and sellers and/or manufacturers (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0016).

As per Claim 66, Osborn discloses a method operable on a computer for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item (Col.), comprising: calculating on a computer, a premium to be charged for each insurance policy issued to the buyer or lessee in the geographic region (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65); receiving an indication of a class of items for

Art Unit: 3687

which insurance is to be provided to a lessor of one of the class of items (See Osborn, Co1.4, lines 45-67); receiving an indication of a geographic region in which the buyer or lessee must reside to receive the insurance (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65); the premium being based on characteristics of the class of items, expected demographics of the buyer or lessee and the geographic region, without consideration of individual characteristics of the buyer or lessee (See Osborn, Co1.i, lines 53-65).

Osborn does not explicitly disclose a method operable on a computer for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Thompson. In particular, Thompson suggests a method operable on a computer for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0015; Page 8, Paragraph 0117).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Thompson within the system of Osborn with the motivation of providing an electronic warranty administration system that interfaces between customers and sellers and/or manufacturers (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0016).

As per claim 67, Osborn discloses comprising: means for calculating a premium to be charged for each insurance policy issued to the buyer or lessee in the geographic region (See Osborn Co1.1, lines 53-65); means for receiving an indication of a class of



Art Unit: 3687

items for which insurance is to be provided to a buyer or lessee of one of the class of items (See Osborn, Co1.2, lines 60-67 to Col.3, line 14); means for receiving an indication of a geographic region in which the buyer or lessee must reside to receive the insurance (See Osborn Co1.1, lines 53-65); and the premium being based on characteristics of the class of items, expected demographics of the buyer or lessee and the geographic region, without consideration of individual characteristics of the buyer or lessee (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65).

Osborn does not explicitly disclose an apparatus for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item. However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Thompson. In particular, Thompson suggests an apparatus for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0015; Page 8, Paragraph 0117).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Thompson within the system of Osborn with the motivation of providing an electronic warranty administration system that interfaces between customers and sellers and/or manufacturers (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0016).

As per claim 68, Osborn discloses comprising: a processor (See Osborn Col.4, lines 28-34); and a memory in communication with the processor, the memory for storing a plurality of processing instructions enabling the processor to (See Osborn • Co1.2, lines 60-67 to Co1.3, line 26): calculate a premium to be charged for each

Art Unit: 3687

insurance policy issued to the buyer or lessee in the geographic region (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65); receive an indication of a class of items for which insurance: is to be provided to a buyer or lessee of one of the class of items (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53- 65); receive an indication of a geographic region in which the buyer or lessee must reside to receive the insurance (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65); the premium being based on characteristics of the class of items and the geographic region, without consideration of individual characteristics of the buyer or lessee (See Osborn, Col.1, lines 53-65).

Osborn does not explicitly disclose an apparatus for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item. However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Thompson. In particular, Thompson suggests an apparatus for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providin.g insurance to a buyer or lessee of an item (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0015; Page 8, Paragraph 0117).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Thompson within the system of Osborn with the motivation of providing an electronic warranty administration system that interfaces between customers and sellers and/or manufacturers (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0016).

As per claim 69, Osborn discloses the method comprising: calculating a premium to be charged for each insurance policy issued to the lessor in the geographic region

Art Unit: 3687

(See Osborn Co1.1, lines 53-65); receiving an indication of a class of items for which insurance is to be provided to a lessee of one of the class of items(See Osborn, Col.2, lines 60-67 to Col.3, line 26); receiving an indication of a geographic region in which the lessee must reside to receive the insurance (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65); the premium being based on characteristics of the class of items, the expected demographics of the lessee and the geographic region, without consideration of individual characteristics of the lessee (See Osborn, Col. 1, lines 53-65).

Osborn does not explicitly disclose a computer-readable medium encoded with processing instructions for implementing a method, performed by a computer, for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a lessee of an item.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Thompson. In particular, Thompson suggests a computer-readable medium encoded with processing instructions for implementing a method, performed by a computer, for determining an insurance premium to be charged to a party providing insurance to a lessee of an item (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0015; Page 8, Paragraph 0117).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Thompson within the system of Osborn with the motivation of providing an electronic warranty administration system that interfaces between customers and sellers and/or manufacturers (See Thompson, Page 2, Paragraph 0016).

Art Unit: 3687

As per claim 76, Osborn discloses an apparatus wherein the vehicle is an automobile (See Osborn, Co1.1, lines 53-65); and the paid insurance policy is in accordance with at least the minimum requirements for an automobile set by a state within which the geographic region resides (See Osborn, Col.1, lines 53-67).

As per claim 77, Thompson discloses an apparatus wherein the paid insurance policy includes at least one of the group comprising collision coverage, uninsured motorist coverage and liability coverage (See Thompson, Page 6, Paragraph 0090).

Claims 75 and 80 recite the same limitations as claim 68 above, are therefore rejected under the same rationale and incorporated herein.

Claim 98 recites the same limitations as claim 18 above, are therefore rejected under the same rationale and incorporated herein.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VANEL FRENEL whose telephone number is (571)272-6769. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew S. Gart can be reached on 571-272-3955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3687

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Vanel Frenel/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3687

November 13, 2008